UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,654	06/01/2006	Roger Biel	CL/V-33539A	3939
	7590 08/15/200 CORPORATION		EXAMINER	
PATENT DEPA	ARTMENT		SLOMSKI, REBECCA	
11460 JOHNS CREEK PARKWAY DULUTH, GA 30097-1556			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2877	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/581,654	BIEL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	REBECCA C. SLOMSKI	2877			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Jules</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	r election requirement. r. □ accepted or b)⊠ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		` ,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The references cited in the Search Report PCT/EP04/13783 have been considered, but will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application because they were not provided on a separate list in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). In order to have the references printed on such resulting patent, a separate listing, preferably on a PTO/SB/08A and 08B form, must be filed within the set period for reply to this Office action.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they contain black marks and lines around the border and numbers. Additionally, Figures 2 and 3 are black and blurry, not adding any information or clarify to the invention. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Dark-field and Bright-field Inspection Unit for Tinted Contact Lens.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

1. With respect to claims 1-4, the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim

which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

2. With respect to claims 1-4, the claims provides for the use of a dark-field inspection unit, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/581,654 Page 5

Art Unit: 2877

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rhody et al. U.S. Patent # 6,047,082.

- 3. With respect to claim 1, Rhody discloses an automatic lens inspection system comprising:
 - The use of a dark field inspection unit for the automatic inspection of a tinted contact lens (Abstract, dark spot imaging – dark field inspection, colored iris area = tinted contact lens)
- 4. With respect to claim 2, Rhody discloses all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. In addition, Rhody discloses:
 - The dark-field inspection is based on the schlieren method (Figure 5, aperture 57
 defines an aperture stop located between camera 63 and the contact lens 15 as
 described in the specification of the current application)
- 5. With respect to claim 4, Rhody discloses all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. In addition, Rhody discloses:
 - The contact lens is an opaque tinted lens (Figure 4a, 4b, wherein the shaded region is the colored iris area = tinted area that blocks the passage of some of the light)

Application/Control Number: 10/581,654 Page 6

Art Unit: 2877

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim **3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhody et al. U.S. Patent #6,047,082 in view of Doke et al. U.S. Patent #6,134,342.

- 6. With respect to claim 3, Rhody discloses all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. However, Rhody fails to specifically disclose using a bright-field inspection unit as well.

 Doke discloses a visual inspection method for contact lens comprising:
 - The dark-field inspection unit is combined with a bright-field inspection unit (Col.3, L 62-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a bright-field inspection unit with the dark-field inspection unit of Rhody since this would allow inspections for a greater number of defects.

Citations

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Application/Control Number: 10/581,654 Page 7

Art Unit: 2877

• Hofer et al. U.S. Patent #6,314,199 discloses a process for examining eye devices

• Fukuma et al. U.S. Patent #6,937,328 discloses a method for measuring refractive power

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to REBECCA C. SLOMSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-9787. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-2059. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. G. Lauchman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2877

Rebecca C. Slomski

Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/581,654

Page 8

Art Unit: 2877

rcs